

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 287

CE 052 566

AUTHOR Sheppard, Harold L.; Rix, Sara E.
TITLE Retooling the Older Worker: The Case of the United States.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Programs; *Attitude Change; Dislocated Workers; *Economic Development; Educational Needs; *Employer Attitudes; Job Training; *Middle Aged Adults; *Older Adults; Postsecondary Education; *Retraining
IDENTIFIERS *Older Workers

ABSTRACT

With the aging of the U.S. population, fewer younger workers are available to join the work force. Therefore, if economic growth is to be sustained, more older workers must remain in the work force or rejoin it. Some policies have been enacted to promote the employment of older workers. They include the prohibition of age discrimination and the gradual increase in the age at which retirement benefits begin under Social Security. Often, older workers must be retrained to keep up with the changes in technology that occur rapidly. Some barriers to retraining older workers exist, mostly attitudinal. Training programs are available for older workers; although they have been effective, they are few. Older workers continue to be underrepresented in job training and postsecondary education enterprises. Economic growth in the United States will require more retraining of older workers and changes in the attitudes that currently limit such retraining. (Appendices include 50 references, data tables on older worker employment and education, summaries of relevant laws and programs, and addresses for training and information sources.) (KC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

NOT FOR QUOTATION
or
PUBLICATION

ED308287

RETOOLING THE OLDER WORKER: THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES

by

Harold L. Sheppard, Ph.D.
Director
International Exchange Center on Gerontology
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

and

Sara E. Rix, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Women's Research and Education Institute
Washington, D.C. 20009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

HL Sheppard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE052566

Contents

Overview.....	1
Policies to Promote Older Worker Employment.....	5
Training Programs for Older Workers:	
Availability and Participation.....	6
Publicly Financed Training Programs for Older Workers.....	10
Private Sector Programs.....	15
Not-for-Profit Efforts.....	19
The Representation of Women in Older Worker Training Programs....	20
Value of Training.....	21
Future Training Needs.....	23
References	
Appendix A: Tables	
Appendix B: Summaries of Selected Older Worker Laws and Programs	
Appendix C: Older Worker Training Resources and Information	

Retrofitting the Older Worker: The Case of the United States

Overview

The aging of the population of the United States, accompanied as it is or will be by a substantial decline in the number of young people in the labor force (Table A1), a pronounced withdrawal of middle-aged and older workers from the labor force (Tables A2 and A3), and escalating costs of supporting an ever older dependent population, has sparked debate in some circles about the potential merits of prolonging older workers' labor force attachment. In fact, the Secretary of Labor warned in 1987 that the future will require the utilization of workers over the age of 50 (William Brock, cited in the Bureau of National Affairs, 1987: 83).

More recently (1988), the Labor Department's Deputy Undersecretary for Labor-Management Relations, John R. Stepp, announced that older workers nevertheless are becoming a smaller proportion of the U.S. labor force. Workers aged 55 and older constituted 17 percent of the 1972 labor force and only 13 percent in 1988. Without any new policy directives, workers in this age group are expected to be only 11 percent of the labor force in the year 2000. Mr. Stepp's explanation included (1) the impact of both social security and private-sector pension plans, especially as the latter have provided for non-actuarially reduced early retirement benefits, (2) encouragement of early retirement as a cost-saving device (senior employees are typically higher paid), (3) employer stereotypes about work, retraining capacity, and aging, (4) and the apparent trend toward greater valuation of leisure over work, particularly when job tasks are unrewarding.

To date, much of the interest in promoting older worker employment and training opportunities has been restricted to advocacy organizations for the elderly, a small number of businesses confronted with highly specialized skills shortages, and industries that have traditionally drawn their employees from the now shrinking pool of younger workers.

If anything, weakening older worker attachment to the labor force continues as the predominant corporate policy in the United States. Some 62 percent of the more than 350 companies surveyed by the Conference Board in the early 1980s had pension plans that contained early (pre-65) retirement inducements, while only four percent cited any incentives to discourage retirement beyond age 65 (Rhine, 1984: 1, 4). And those companies with inducements did not offer them to just any older worker, but rather to employees with scarce skills or high performance records. Employers who might be inclined to target older workers for employment are apparently confronted with a lack of good resources on how to recruit or train them (Gamse, 1988).

Further working against the establishment of older worker programs is corporate downsizing. Just under half (45 percent) of the more than 1,100

company respondents to a 1987 American Management Association Survey had undergone "significant" reductions in force between January 1986 and June 1987, and additional ones were anticipated by other firms over the following year (American Association of Retired Persons [AARP], 1987: 9). When companies are faced with the need or desire to pare down staff, anything that might foster the retention of "disposable" workers would be counterproductive.

Prevailing negative attitudes about older workers' flexibility in a rapidly changing technological workforce play their part in employers' reluctance to retain older workers. If a 1985 survey conducted for the American Association of Retired Persons is any guide, older workers get high marks from employers for dependability, loyalty, and commitment, but they fare less well when it comes to assessments about their "trainability." Only 17 percent of the 400 human resource decisionmakers included in that survey rated older workers' ability to learn new skills as either "excellent" or "very good," and about 40 percent viewed older workers as resistant to change. Moreover, only 10 percent believed that older workers were comfortable with new technologies, a perception that appeared to be "particularly acute" in large companies where efforts to introduce new technology to improve productivity were considerable (American Association of Retired Persons, undated: 6, 12). Such reservations undoubtedly influence employers' decisions about whom and when to train.

Employers also have reservations about the long-run payoff from updating the skills of older workers. It obviously makes little sense to invest in an employee on the threshold of retirement, but the costs and benefits of training middle-aged workers are not so obvious. If lost productivity and salary replacement are the measures, young workers may indeed be cheaper to train. However, if payback is measured in terms of years of service to a firm after training or retraining, older workers may come out ahead, in view of the fact that job turnover is less common among them than among younger ones (Carnevale, 1986: 50), and recruiting is expensive. The costs of recruiting, selecting, hiring, and retraining a data processing professional might be as much as 60 percent of the first year's salary (Nye, 1988: 30). Moreover, Root and Zarrugh (1983: 3) point out that for some technologies, a worker's remaining worklife might exceed the life of the new technology for which he or she was trained, reinforcing the value of training a worker likely to remain with a firm.

Because older employees themselves possess some of these same doubts about the return on investing time and effort in training (Andrisani and Daymont, 1987: 68), both interest and participation in training drop with age. Training that would require an older worker to start anew as an entry level worker--which might be expected after learning an entirely new skill--would probably appeal to relatively few older workers, most of whom would be unwilling to face the wage or salary reductions associated with entry level work.

Finally, older workers have bought into one of the great success stories of the 20th century--an affordable and early retirement, made possible by

the availability of social security benefits at age 62, the indexing of those benefits, and the expansion of private pension coverage. Although more than four out of five workers 40 and older expressed interest in retraining in a 1986 survey (American Association of Retired Persons, 1986a: 11), they are apparently putting little pressure on their employers to provide them with it. A dearth of age discrimination cases that involve training issues (Bureau of National Affairs, 1986: 86) may reflect this lack of concern. (It may also, of course, indicate that older workers do not realize that they are protected against discrimination, that they do not feel they have been discriminated against, or that they actually have not experienced discrimination with regard to training.)

Another AARP report cites the government's projections of impending skill shortages due to the reduced birth rate and points out that many employers are exploring ways of recruiting and retaining older workers (American Association of Retired Persons, 1986b). This may involve dissemination of research findings about the weak relationship, if any, between productivity and age, as well as the use of training and job redesign as ways to adapt older workers to new skill demands and technology.

Other personnel experts suggest greater cost-effectiveness of multi-employer training resources, as well as the recruitment of retired professionals, either as mentor/trainers or as direct employees themselves.

Stereotypes among American trainers can lead to the neglect of training and retraining of older workers in U.S. industry, even though the demographic dynamics call for greater participation of older persons in training programs. Any changes in attitudes, however, may need to be accompanied by appropriate training approaches and methods, e.g., the use of effective audio-visual aids, increased use of feedback, and memory assistance techniques.

Older displaced workers frequently lack the skills necessary to obtain a new job, which may contribute to their low reemployment rates and the lower wages often experienced once reemployed. Findings such as these form the basis for recommendations for retraining to meeting the challenge of job loss among older workers (Shapiro and Sandell, 1985).

Retraining and skill upgrading are becoming increasingly recognized as desirable even for middle-aged and older executives (Mintz, 1986). In providing such training, care must be taken to use more time and concentration for the absorption of highly technical material. Furthermore, executives (mostly older) tend to be leery about having to undergo new skills acquisition or retraining.

A 1982 survey of training needs of older workers in a U.S. federal agency revealed a strong preference for computer and technological training and for training in management (Tucker, 1985). The report recommended:

- determining automation needs for use in training program and design,

- making greater use of older workers themselves as trainers, and
- surveying employers to determine staffing needs and available resources.

Computer training provides a closer example of the possible need to tailor-make the training guidelines to facilitate older worker instruction. These guidelines include allowing for self-regulated training, generous amounts of practice time, and use of other older persons as trainers (Anderson, 1983).

The need for older worker training is especially acute because in many instances previous training has not been recent, "learning skills" have been diminished through lack of use, and/or the training has been for obsolete skills.

An essential ingredient of employer programs for older workers is the recognition by employers that such workers can be a "solution to specific business problems. It is the recognition of need, rather than a sense of corporate social responsibility, that offers the most promise for the continued growth in older worker employment opportunities" (Rothstein, 1988).

The same principle applies to the field of training. Employer needs include (1) the importance of a flexible work force (meaning a small core employee group in some industries) allowing for seasonal expansion and contraction through temporary, part-time, and/or work-sharing arrangements; (2) holding onto experienced personnel in labor-scarce industries or regions (which might involve the permanent part-time employment of a company's own retirees); (3) a labor shortage resulting from the shrinking pool of young labor force entrants and the consequent need to keep, hire, and train "mature" personnel, and (4) a preference for older persons because of their lower turnover and absenteeism, better work habits, etc., as compared with young employees.

Undoubtedly, there is an indirect, perhaps unmeasurable impact of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA). Several successful cases in the courts concerning such discrimination (especially through "premature" discharges or retirement), involving heavy dollar costs to corporations, have alerted the employer community to the value of compliance with the Act. From 1981 to 1985 alone, the federal agency administering the ADEA--the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)--saw the proportion of its total case workload consisting of age discrimination cases grow from 11.6 percent to 23.3 percent. From 1981 to 1987, the number of such complaints had doubled. "...[T]hat sends a strong message to businesses about the need to exercise considerable sensitivity in dealing with older employees and applicants" (Rothstein, 1988).

Policies to Promote Older Worker Employment

Age Discrimination in Employment: Although older workers are not yet, to any significant extent, demanding training policies and programs that would promote their employment opportunities, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act is designed to protect workers who might want to avail themselves of what exists.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended in subsequent years, does not require employers to provide such employment enhancers as training, flexible work schedules, or meaningful part-time work. However, with one exception, equal treatment of employees of all ages is required; employers may not use age as the criterion for participation in in-house training programs, for example, although the law does not require that they encourage older workers to participate.

The exception involves apprenticeship programs. Under the current interpretation of the EEOC, apprenticeship programs are exempt from the proscriptions of the law, thus permitting employers and unions to use age as the sole criterion for rejecting potential apprentices. In 1984, the EEOC voted to rescind this age exemption, but the Office of Management and Budget never acted on the decision, and the EEOC ultimately reversed itself.

Age discrimination legislation has by no means eliminated discriminatory behavior on the part of employers. In many cases, it has merely made it more difficult to detect. The National Commission for Employment Policy (1985) maintains that while older workers fare better than younger ones in many respects, they do continue to confront age discrimination. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act does, however, provide a legal mechanism for workers to attempt to redress perceived inequities. And, in 1986, Congress approved amendments to the ADEA that virtually eliminated mandatory retirement at any age, thus extending the legal protection of workers aged 40 and above.

Retirement Age Increases: As part of its effort to restore long-range financial solvency to the social security system, Congress in 1983 approved a gradual increase in the age of eligibility for full social security benefits. Beginning in the year 2000, the current full retirement age of 65 will be increase by two months a year until it reaches 66 in 2005. Full retirement age will remain at 66 until 2017, at which time it will increase by another two months per year until it reaches 67. Social security benefits will still be available at age 62, but they will be substantially lower than the actuarially reduced benefits currently available at that age.

Whether this effort to raise the retirement age will have a significant impact remains to be seen; some observers argue that as long as employers use private pension inducements to encourage early retirement, workers will opt to leave the labor force at the age those inducements are

available. It is certainly too early for the 1983 amendments to have had an effect on training programs, but workers who fall under the law are reaching their vulnerable years: the oldest are in their 40s. If large numbers of these workers operate under the assumption that they will remain in the labor force longer than workers of the present, employers may begin to respond to the need to maximize their productivity by offering more training opportunities.

Training Programs for Older Workers: Availability and Participation

Federal efforts aside, programs and policies--most specifically those involving training--to foster delayed retirement and increase the productivity of older workers, while they exist, are apparently not prevalent (Root and Zarrugh, 1983; National Commission on Employment Policy, 1985; Bureau of National Affairs, 1987; U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1987). Media attention that has been paid to a few older worker programs may be painting a misleading picture of their pervasiveness.

Bové (1987:77) writes in the Training and Development Journal that "...there is no statistical evidence to indicate that such programs are anything more than the efforts of a few enlightened corporations to grapple with a problem that should [given the aging of the workforce] interest all." But in point of fact, good estimates of just how many employers offer training programs to their older workers (or to workers of any age, for that matter), or how many workers actually participate in any programs, are unavailable. Nor is there any systematically acquired information on the content of training programs for older workers. The Senate Committee on Aging cites a 1986 study in which only two percent of the responding firms provided training specifically for the older employee (U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1987: 143), but while the available training programs for older workers are probably not extensive, employers might be reluctant to admit targeting programs to a specific group. In addition, older workers may prefer not to participate in programs that single them out as "special" and by virtue of that label, less capable. For example, The Travelers, a large diversified financial company that for the past decade has been promoting the temporary rehiring of its retirees, was discouraged by its older workers from offering age-segregated training programs. Thus, the two percent might be an underestimate.

Still, judging from these and other data, the United States does not appear to be awash in training programs for older workers. The National Caucus and Center on Black Aged recently (1987) identified some highly effective older worker training programs, part of whose success was due to offering occupational skills training to persons needing update. Acknowledging the fact that the study was not meant to be a systematic survey of such programs in the United States, it is still significant that only three of the 36 programs described in their report were private programs; virtually all of the rest were federally funded Job Training Partnership Act or Senior Community Service Employment programs.

Nearly half of the human resource decisionmakers in AARP's 1985 survey felt that older worker skill training would be effective in "increasing their utilization," and 30 percent said their companies had begun to implement such programs (American Association of Retired Persons, undated: 20). No information is provided, however, on how far along in the implementation phase they had gotten or just what the training programs actually involve.

The National Older Workers Information Employment System (NOWIS), an information retrieval system of private sector programs and practices for older workers, was developed at the University of Michigan to serve as a resource for employers, unions, and others interested in the potential of older employees. Of the 369 programs and practices from 180 companies on file in the Fall of 1984, only 10.3 percent, or less than 40, dealt with training, and few of those programs--though they might be especially applicable to older workers--were designed solely with their needs in mind (U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1985).

On the one hand, the NOWIS data base was never meant to be an exhaustive or even representative catalogue of all relevant programs and businesses in the United States. Rather, by reflecting the range of available programs, the goal was to provide models of workable programs. NOWIS programs were identified through an intensive literature search, contact with 80 national organizations dealing with elderly and employment issues, and referrals from companies with existing older worker programs. As a result, many so-called "invisible" programs undoubtedly remained invisible.

On the other hand, these caveats about sampling aside, it is perhaps still significant that the data base in 1984 included only 180 businesses out of more than 12 million firms in the United States.

Recently, the data base has been acquired by the American Association of Retired Persons, which has been updating the original NOWIS information. Some of the firms in the original system have gone out of business; others have eliminated their older workers programs; some have merged with other companies. As a result, a request to NOWIS for an update on training programs in the Spring of 1988 yielded only four, though it should be stressed that the system as it currently stands includes only "cases" from the original sample.¹ A major effort is now underway to expand the file with information from public, nonprofit, and for-profit establishments that have adopted programs since the early 1980s. If all goes as planned, NOWIS should become a useful resource of what AARP calls "exemplary programs that go beyond the minimum ADEA requirements."

Two-thirds of the 350 firms surveyed by the Conference Board reported

¹ Some program summaries are available only to other businesses, so the training component may actually exceed four.

having programs that enable employees to upgrade their job-related skills and knowledge, and half said that workers 50 and older were as likely as other workers to "avail themselves of such programs" (Rhine, 1984: 22). Unfortunately, the number of workers of any age who take advantage of the programs was not reported; nor does the report indicate whether workers of various ages were actually encouraged by supervisors to accept tuition aid (offered by 62 percent of the companies with updating programs), involve themselves in on-the-job training and development (offered by 61 percent), or participate in courses and seminars (offered by 46 percent).

Another Conference Board study reported an increase between 1977 and 1985 in the proportion of workers participating in company-sponsored training programs. The gain in participation was greatest among workers 25 to 55 years of age and lowest among those 55 and older. The continuing trend toward early retirement was given as the reason for the latter development (Lusterman, 1985: 22). Moreover, the Conference Board found a shift in the criteria for participation in such training programs: there was less self-selection and more emphasis on the relevance of the program to corporate goals (ibid.: 12), which may augur ill for older workers whose perceived contribution to the corporate good is seen to lie in early retirement.

Nevertheless, on the "supply" side, unpublished data from a 1981 survey by Louis Harris and Associates for the National Council on the Aging reveal that among workers 55-64 years old, 48 percent were somewhat or very interested in learning new skills and participating in a job training program so they could take on a different job. This proportion varied according to level of schooling, with the less educated (under 12 years of schooling) expressing less interest.

As for actual, recent experience in continued training or education, 17 percent of these 55-64 year-old workers and 10 percent of those 65 and older reported in 1981 that in just the past year they had taken courses. Approximately two-fifths of the 55-64 year-olds had attended programs at an employer's establishment. More than one-half of all such students had taken course to acquire better job skills.

Data from AARP's survey show that two-thirds of the 1,300 workers 40 and older had received some job training over the past three years (American Association of Retired Persons, 1986a). Training was most common among workers in their 40s (74 percent) and somewhat less frequent among workers 50 to 62 (61 percent), while it dropped to a still respectable 50 percent for workers 63 and above. These proportions varied according to socioeconomic status: the higher the status (as measured by income, education, or occupation), the greater the proportion receiving training. Equally important, a higher percentage of public sector than of private sector workers--75 percent vs. only 58 percent--had received job training (American Association of Retired Persons, 1986a: 11).

Again, data on the specifics of the training are skimpy, but the report did note that it typically involved on-the-job training to upgrade skills. Moreover, of the four out of five AARP respondents who "expressed a wish

for training opportunities," it is significant that more than three-fourths of the 50-62 year-old workers preferred job-related training, and that this was also true of more than one-half of respondents 63 and older:

<u>Training Preferred</u>	<u>Age</u>		
	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-62</u>	<u>63+</u>
Updating of current skills	37%	44%	35%
To get a better but similar/ totally different job	43	33	19
Not related to job	12	9	9
No training	4	10	31

These finding appears to be consistent with the reasons people take adult education courses (Table A4), according to the U.S. Department of Education (1987). As of 1984, more than 4.3 million adult education courses were taken by men and women 55 and older. Most of the courses--68 percent--taken by men between the ages of 55 and 64 were for job-related reasons. The corresponding proportion for women in the same age group was 48 percent. Nearly all of the job-related courses were taken "to advance on the job." For the most part, their courses seemed practical and designed to assist with job-related aspirations: the top three courses for men were business, engineering, and health care; for women, they were health care, business, and the arts. (Courses taken by oldest respondents, those 65 and above, were, not surprisingly given their low labor force participation rates, far less likely to be job-related.)

Still, older workers are underrepresented in post-secondary education (Table A5). Persons 55-64, for example, were 12 percent of the population in 1982, but less than one percent of the enrollees in academic programs, typically the purview of the young, and less than three percent (or 95,000) of the vocational educational participants. At nearly 10 percent, however, they were somewhat better represented among the continuing education students (National Center for Education Statistics, 1987). This works out to a participation rate of just two percent for persons between the ages of 55 and 64.

Finally, as a way of indicating the importance of training in the retirement decisions, 17 percent of the respondents between the ages of 50 and 62 in AARP's older worker survey, and nine percent of those 63 and older said they were "much more likely" to delay early retirement if they could have job training (American Association of Retired Persons, 1986a: 14).

Publicly Financed Training Programs for Older Workers

The nation's two major employment programs for the older persons are the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act and Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), both of which target services to the economically disadvantaged, and both of which serve a small percentage of the eligible population. The pre-1983 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act involved far larger numbers, but older worker participation, relative to their share of the long-term unemployed, was low.

Senior Community Service Employment Program: The older and more visible of the two programs is the Senior Community Service Employment Program, or SCSEP, established in 1965, "to promote useful part-time opportunities in community services activities for low income persons." Federal funds (\$331 million for Program Year 1988-89) are awarded to eight national sponsoring organizations (see Appendix C) and state agencies to assist unemployed persons 55 and older whose incomes do not exceed 125 percent of the poverty level. Appropriations for Program Year 1988-89 will fund just under 65,000 job slots. Because of turnover, dropouts, and private sector placement, considerably more workers are "served" in any one year than the number of funded slots would imply.

SCSEP is more of a job creation program than a training program. Although participants may receive some training, it is generally provided on-the-job, after placement, and is usually "oriented toward teaching and upgrading skills" (U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1988: 122). Relatively little emphasis has been placed on formal training programs (Centaur, 1986). Instead, the goal has been to place participants in minimum wage public service jobs, such as health care and education, that will benefit the community. This may change, however, with the Secretary of Labor's recent mandate to place 20 percent of workers in private sector jobs.

A popular program, SCSEP has generally managed to hold its own during the cutbacks in social and related programs since 1981. Though funding for the 1988-89 program year will support about 900 fewer job slots than the previous year (U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1988: 122), the program has generally expanded over the years.

The virtue of the SCSEP program lies not in its training but in its providing much needed employment to a population that private sector employers find relatively unattractive. Over 60 percent of the participants have been women and about 80 percent over the age of 60. Half have not graduated from high school, and minorities are overrepresented. Without considerably more formal training, the average SCSEP participant would have a very difficult time securing private sector employment.

502(e) Experimental Projects: A push to provide more private sector employment under SCSEP was made with the establishment of experimental programs funded under section 502(e) of Title V of the Older Americans

Act, administered by the Department of Labor. These projects "were to focus on increasing older worker participation in the private sector, especially in high technology and high growth fields, by combinations of worksharing, flexitime, and other means to expand employment opportunities" (Centaur Associates, 1986: 3). Although these programs were authorized under the 1978 Older Americans Act amendments, the first ones were not implemented until January of 1983, and an attempt to evaluate their effectiveness not made until 1986.

Centaur Associates reported that some 2,800 participants had entered experimental programs during the first three program years, and 55 percent entered private sector employment. In contrast to the regular SCSEP programs, the experimental programs focused more extensively on training, most commonly classroom training, as well as work experience, on-the-job training, and transitional services. Classroom training tended to involve several weeks of occupational skills development for such work as word processing.

Program operators seemed to agree that experimental training should be for jobs in growth industries, and the range of employer participation in the 502(e) programs--home health care, clerical, assembly, construction, custodial, retail, hotel/management--does reflect growing occupations, but they are not "high tech." In fact, there seemed to be a general feeling that "even entry level jobs in high technology fields require extensive training that they believe most unemployed older workers are reluctant to undergo" (ibid.: 11).

The 502(e) program also allowed participants to be recruited from outside the population of SCSEP enrollees, and "outsiders" tended to be the recruits as program operators sought workers who could obtain private sector jobs. Experimental enrollees possessed characteristics more likely to appeal to private sector employers than did the regular SCSEP participants: in particular, they were younger and better educated. They were also somewhat more likely to be female and less likely to be minority. The selection of more promising job candidates is known as "creaming," but the 502(e) evaluators suggest that persons motivated to seek private sector employment were themselves likely to opt for the experimental rather than the regular SCSEP program.

Centaur noted that project operators were faced with trying to convince employers that "older workers were a good investment" (ibid.: 20). Age discrimination turned out to be a barrier to placement. Moreover, operators were clearly limited by the fact that no additional funds were allocated for experimental programs and that grantees were obligated to maintain their regular SCSEP authorized slots. Nonetheless, despite the limitations, the experimental projects did give program operators greater experience in dealing with the private sector, which might increase their effectiveness in locating private sector opportunities for the less advantaged regular SCSEP enrollees in the future.

The Job Training Partnership Act: The second major older worker program is the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), which went into effect in

October 1983 as the successor to CETA, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Most training programs are funded under Title IIA, which "authorizes a wide range of training and related activities to participants." Under IIA, 78 percent of the funds must be spent for training services to disadvantaged youths and adults. In addition, 22 percent is to be "set aside" or used for special activities, among which are training programs for older workers (three percent of the funds).

JTPA is a training program for economically disadvantaged persons, although the legislation does allow up to 10 percent of the participants to fall outside of this category if they face employment barriers. Older workers and displaced homemakers are two groups singled out as possible victims of employment barriers.

Older workers have traditionally competed with younger workers for federally funded training programs and have just as traditionally been underserved. This is as true of JTPA programs as it was of CETA. JTPA's eligibility requirements, however, are far less stringent than CETA's, which required workers to be economically disadvantaged and unemployed, underemployed, or in school. Even so, the age distribution of participants in the most comparable programs of the two acts (IIB/C of CETA and IIA of JTPA) is almost identical (Table A6): participants 55 and older have been about two to three percent of the participants of the two programs. At four percent of the total, workers between the ages of 45 and 54 have not fared much better.

The Department of Labor's Job Training Quarterly Survey indicates that about three percent of the total IIA enrollees and terminees in Program Years 1985 and 1986 have been 55 and older. Using the Department of Labor's total enrollment figures, this works out to approximately 20,000 to 21,000 older terminees in each of those two years (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987), though this may be somewhat of an underestimate. Sandell and Rupp (1988), in a recent detailed analysis of the IIA enrollees in Program Years 1984 and 1985, observed that although nearly 4.4 million people 55-64 were technically eligible (i.e., economically disadvantaged) for JTPA IIA, only 17,200, or 0.4 percent of the eligibles, actually participated. Over the first two full program years of JTPA, workers 55 and older were 14 percent of the eligible JTPA population but only 2.4 percent of the IIA enrollees.

Participation in JTPA IIA programs declines dramatically with age, which Sandell and Rupp attribute to declining rates of labor force participation and other factors influencing demand for training. There is a greater tendency for older unemployed workers to leave the labor force and to express an apparent preference for other types of help than long-term training. In a study of CETA participation, Rupp, Bryant, and Montovani (1983: 20) also concluded that the lower demand for participation among older workers was probably due to their lower labor force participation.

Furthermore, while 10 percent of the population 55-64 and over have incomes below the poverty level, the unemployment rate for this age group has been less than five percent in recent years. (In fact, unemployment

rates tend to drop with age [Table A7]). Income eligibility for training programs makes sense, if one assumes that very low-income workers whose skills are upgraded will earn more. Nonetheless, people with jobs--even if economically disadvantaged--would be under less pressure than the unemployed to seek out training programs, and program operators might themselves see greater need among the unemployed. Sandell and Rupp did discover higher JTPA IIA participation rates among unemployed eligibles: 11 percent of the eligible unemployed older women and 4.6 percent of the men were enrolled in JTPA programs during the two years reviewed by Sandell and Rupp.

JTPA IIA participants can receive several different types of training services (classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience, job search assistance), assignment to which tends to be proportional to their distribution in the IIA population (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987 and 1988, selected tables). Older participants seem, however, to be slightly overrepresented among the recipients of job search assistance, which may reflect their longer work histories and consequent readiness for work relative to the young disadvantaged who need more preparation to become job-ready. In Program Year 1986, 70 percent of the 55 and older terminees, as well as 72 percent of those between the ages of 45 and 54, were reported to have entered unsubsidized employment (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987: Table C-29). These figures were well above the national standard set for the JTPA program that year.

JTPA Three Percent Set Aside or Older Worker Program: The federal government does not require reporting on the characteristics of participants in any of the JTPA set-asides, which makes assessment of who is served rather difficult. (The Department of Labor's Job Training Quarterly Survey includes participants in the three percent programs administered by II-A operators, but not those in independently administered programs [Sandell and Rupp, 1988: 49].) To gather information on the set aside and its participants, the National Governors Association (NGA) conducted a survey of participants in the three-percent set-aside programs of Program Year 1984 (Alegria and Figueroa, 1986). Responses were received from 37 states, which covered some 70 percent of the set-aside resources for that year.

To qualify for participation in a three-percent set-aside program, an enrollee must be 55 or older and economically disadvantaged. As of 1984, 18,180 older people were being served in the 34 states that reported enrollment figures to the NGA.

Though comparative data are limited, it appears that with respect to sex, minority status, education, and public assistance receipt, older (55+) JTPA II-A participants are comparable to participants in the three percent set-aside programs. Services provided JTPA enrollees, however, apparently vary by program and by sex. Despite the fact that on-the-job training is often cited as the most successful three percent training program (Alegria and Lordeman, 1988: 13), Alegria and Figueroa (1986: 17, 18) observed that older workers were far more likely to obtain assistance with looking for work than the total IIA population, but somewhat less likely to receive

classroom or on-the job training:

<u>Training Received</u>	<u>IIA (22+)</u>	<u>IIA (55+)</u>	<u>Three percent (55+)</u>
Classroom training	37%	31%	27%
On-the-job training	27	24	21
Job search assistance	23	47	57
Work experience	4	2	8

With regard to the differences among the programs, the NGA authors point out that "the data reflect comments by state administrators that they have trouble developing [on-the-job training] slots for individuals because of the negative attitudes held by some employers regarding the hiring of older workers" (ibid.: 17).

Two-thirds of both the IIA (69 percent) and the three percent set-aside (64 percent) trainees entered unsubsidized employment; however, there was relatively little additional information on program outcomes. Hourly wages were somewhat higher for the older IIA trainees than for the three percent ones.

JTPA Title III: Older workers can also be served under Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act if they are displaced workers who lose their jobs because of business closings or employment cutbacks. Between 1981 and 1986, an estimated 10.8 million Americans lost their jobs for such reasons; 5.1 million of them met the Labor Department's criteria for displaced workers and were, until they were reemployed, presumably eligible for assistance under JTPA. However, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) has estimated that at most, seven percent of the eligible workers received assistance under Title III (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1987). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 20 percent of dislocated workers were 55 and over in 1984, but only eight percent of the Title III enrollees were in that age group. The Labor Department's Job Training Quarterly statistics reveal comparable statistics for 1985 and 1986 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987: Table C-49).

Older worker participation tended to be higher when projects were employer/union operated, but many projects funded under Title III had no older enrollees, according to GAO. Underrepresentation of such workers is a concern because of the greater problem that they have in finding new employment.

While there are a number of possible explanations for older workers' underrepresentation, e.g., nervousness about ability to succeed in a training program, lack of minimum qualifications, or service elsewhere, GAO noted pointedly that over half of the projects studied "reported that, at least to some extent, their selection of participants was influenced by the applicant's potential for placement" (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1987: 43). Project officials told GAO that "based on their experience, employers were reluctant to hire workers over age 55 or those with less than a high school education."

Even if older workers had been equitably served under Title II programs, it is by no means certain that they would have gotten much in the way of training. Relatively few of the 563 Title III projects in operation between October 1982 and March 1985 provided training or support services; training generally was of short duration, and its type dependent on who operated the project (e.g., classroom training came from educational institutions). Still, placement rates seemed high: 74 percent of the 45-54-year-old terminees in Program Year 1986 entered employment, as did 67 percent of those 55 and over (U.S. Department of Labor, 1987: Table C-53). That the Title III programs were accomplishing some of what the set out to do is suggested by the fact that it seemed to enable workers to move into new lines of work: the majority of workers of all ages surveyed by the GAO had moved into occupations or industries different from their pre-program ones. Had jobs in their previous fields been abundant, they probably would not have wanted training in the first place.

Private Sector Programs

There is nothing inherently wrong with publicly financed training programs, especially if unsubsidized employment can be assured, but it is unlikely that funds will ever be sufficient to meet the needs of all those eligible to participate. Moreover, many older workers whose skills are outdated or who could otherwise benefit from retraining are neither economically disadvantaged nor unemployed. Lack of access to training could be considered a serious impediment to improving U.S. productivity at a time when the numbers of younger labor force entrants are declining.

Moreover, federally funded job training programs may become bureaucratic and inflexible and unable to respond quickly or creatively to particular needs. It may be possible for the government, in combination with the private sector, to develop training programs for occupations or industries where skills are eminently transferrable (e.g., fast foods). Such programs may also be suitable for providing the increasingly necessary remedial skills of reading and mathematics. However, companies themselves are perhaps best equipped to identify and respond to their own unique training needs, and some have done so.

Although many of the original NOWIS programs have been eliminated, several deserve special mention either because of the scope of the program or because of some aspect of it suggests that it might be of interest to other employers.

For example, the Polaroid Corporation is well known for its commitment to development of its employees through education and training, especially through its tuition assistance program. The corporation recognizes the value of an ongoing educational and training program to enhance productivity and adaptability. The program is accessible to employees of all ages. The company's view is that it should invest in middle-aged and older employees' development and retraining because of the payoff to the corporation (Knox, 1979).

Over the years, Crouse-Hinds (a manufacturer of electrical construction materials) in Syracuse, New York, has offered its workers a variety of training programs, among which are a two-year college course designed to develop the professional management skills of foremen and training programs to assist workers in adapting to new technology (e.g., computer assisted design and computer assisted manufacturing). The recent AARP-NOWIS update on Crouse-Hinds notes that "training programs are designed to develop employee skills to the fullest by preparing employees for continuous change in manufacturing technologies within Crouse-Hinds. All employees are encouraged and expected to participate in training and education until the day they decide to retire." Courses have been geared to the adult learner, and the majority of participants in training are between 45 and 60. Crouse-Hinds also makes available tuition programs for retirees, who are encouraged to prepare for part-time or second careers after retirement.

AT&T Bell Laboratories has offered a wide-range of opportunities, including a Continuing Education Program, to its technical and administrative workers. Graduate and undergraduate courses, taught both by Bell Lab Staff and by university faculty and using a variety of course formats and teaching techniques, have covered such technical subjects as pure and applied science, engineering, and computer science. Other courses have taught more basic skills, such as effective writing and English as a second language. As of 1985, over 500 courses, some highly specialized and not available elsewhere, were annually offered to both older and younger workers.

One of the best examples of corporate flexibility and ability to solve employment problems through training is a highly touted program implemented in the 1970s by General Electric's Aerospace Electronics Systems Department in Utica, New York, when it switched from analogue to digital techniques in electronics. General Electric concluded that it would be less expensive to retrain their educated but outdated engineers in the new technology than it would be to hire new employees (Rosen and Jerdee, 1985: 129). The company proceeded to do just that. While it isn't known how many workers would have been terminated or retired without the retraining, it stands to reason that such a total technological shift as that taking place in the company would have resulted in a considerable amount of job loss. General Electric felt that it had clearly benefited from the retraining, which was discontinued once the shift to digital had been successfully completed.

As of 1982, about one-half of the older engineers who had participated in General Electric's "Technical Renewal Program" had gone on voluntarily to take additional courses provided by the company. This renewal program has been succeeded by a continuing Engineering Education Program. The company is concerned with projections showing that within the decade large percentages of the engineering staff would be eligible for "normal" retirement at age 62 (U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1985: 29), which underscores the urgency to retain, by skill updating, older workers before and even after that age.

The General Electric example highlights the abovementioned fact that the private sector will retrain its workers when it is in their best interest to do so. Public programs, in contrast, focus on the individual's need to work. The two goals are not necessarily incompatible, but they may work against one another, as in the case of downsizing companies.

The fast food industry--traditionally heavily dependent on young, cheap labor--is one industry that has specifically eyed the growing pool of older persons as a potential resource. Both McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chicken, two large fast food franchises, have recently undertaken widely publicized efforts to attract older workers. Kentucky Fried Chicken, which in 1987 pledged to provide more than 1,500 jobs for older workers in its more than 1,200 company-owned restaurants, advertises part-time work--long known to be of interest to older workers--with competitive salaries and fringe benefits, including medical and life insurance, paid vacations, and holidays. Older workers are trained to handle both food and customer service.

McMasters, as the McDonald's older worker program is known, was begun in Baltimore, Maryland, in partnership with the State's Office on Aging. As such, it is not solely a private sector venture. In its press materials, McDonald's calls McMasters "an employment program designed to provide skilled training and job placement for individuals 55 years and older." Training of approximately 15 to 20 hours per week in various aspects of the business lasts about four weeks. McDonald's is now operating the program in several states in partnership with a contracting organization; both McDonald's and the contracting organization contribute financially to the training. (The first project was specially funded under the JTPA.) McDonald's has also hired the National Association of State Units on Aging to develop a seminar on how to recruit, supervise and train older workers, as well as on how to deal with the age-related hearing, vision, and other problems.

Coupled with the projected decline in the number of young workers, the projected growth in the fast food industry should foster continued interest in older food service workers. The jobs in question are, however, physically demanding (fast-paced, requiring long periods on one's feet), involve the stress of dealing with the public, tend generally to be low pay, and are perceived as relatively low status. Just how much the positive attributes, such as flexible hours, compensate for these negative will determine whether the older worker/fast-food partnership thrives over the long-run.

Prompted by potential job losses due to foreign competition, an employer, International Silver, and the Steelworkers' Union implemented a program under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1974 that established retraining projects for transition to the production of new products for which there was a market (Jacobson, 1980). In this case, the average age of employees was 56. A special feature of the project was the use of company retirees as part of the instruction staff.

Based in Minneapolis, Minnesota, Control Data Corporation (computer

production and service), one of America's top 200 corporations, offers a varied program of training and retraining to all employees 55 and older. Courses are influenced by the perspective of potential career change in the technology of the company's industry. Much of the emphasis is based on the belief that many persons contemplating early retirement are actually in search of a career change. In addition to a "mid-career course correction program" for workers between the ages of 30 and 55, Control Data offers a variety of alternative work options that might be of particular interest to older workers.

In Bethpage, New York, Grumman Aerospace Corporation has a relatively "old" work force (in 1982, 55 percent of its employees were 45 and older), and, at the same time, a need for a continuing diversified career development program. Grumman has offered a variety of training programs, many of which--like their mid-career training programs--are particularly attractive to aging workers. The company has been well known for its long record of older worker retention and hiring, especially after a personnel policy during a retrenchment period in the 1970s resulted in a marked increase in the age of the company's workforce. Supervisors had been called upon to decide which employees should be retained; retention of the more valued employees meant greater selection of the more experienced, older employees.

Pitney Bowes of Stamford, Connecticut, (manufacturer and servicer of business equipment) provides general educational assistance to all employees, regardless of age, including training especially for new technology, in keeping with the company's shift from mechanical to electronic production.

Less innovative perhaps, but significant in view of where older women in particular are employed (Table A8; see also Table A9 for additional occupational information), are the programs to update workers on new office technologies provided by the Travelers to its returning retirees and the Kelly Services (temporary work). Kelly, which recruits older workers who find flexible work schedules to their liking, helps new workers improve upon rusty skills and learn new software programs. Manpower, Inc., another temporary hiring service, has also developed a system for training new workers, particularly in word processing. The copyrighted training software, which allows workers to learn at their own pace, is seen as especially appropriate for the many reentry workers who are uncomfortable with the new office technology. A fast and reasonably inexpensive system, it has been used to train more than 85,000 temporary workers (Nye, 1988: 18-19).

Texas Refinery Corporation explicitly hires and trains retirees as part-time salespersons for its products throughout the United States and overseas (Canada, Mexico, and Luxembourg). As of 1982, the company had about 500 employees in their 60s, 70s, and 80s. All new salespeople undergo intensive training.

(For descriptions of other, typically small-scale, projects providing training to older persons, see U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on

Aging, 1985; the Bureau of National Affairs, 1987; and the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, 1987.)

Not-for-Profit Efforts

An excellent prototype of the role of the private not-for-profit sector in the field of older worker employment and training is the Chicago-based Project ABLE (Ability Based on Living Experiences). This program has stimulated similar efforts in other parts of the United States. 1986 data from the Chicago agency demonstrate that, contrary to conventional thought, there is a very wide range of occupations for which older workers (55 and above) are actually hired, even on a full-time basis, for example: administrative assistant, dental assistant, librarian, purchasing agent, rental agent, sales clerk, secretary, and sales agent. Among the part-time jobs are bakers, cashiers, data-entry clerks, laboratory workers, receptionist/typists, and tutors.

In less than 10 years, Chicago's Operation ABLE has placed more than 30,000 older men and women in essentially private-sector jobs. The ABLE experience is an illustration of the significant and necessary role that can be performed by "intermediary" mechanisms matching older job-seekers with employers. To repeat, these workers were hired after the age of 55. The success of such projects, of course, assumes a capacity and willingness on the part of the employers to disregard chronological age as a criterion of employment eligibility. But much of that employer capacity and willingness is the product of the intermediary, the non-profit agency's "marketing" of older persons' job skills and qualifications. Labor shortages and employer needs may be necessary but perhaps not sufficient conditions for success in training and hiring of older persons.

In most of the numerous community-based older worker employment projects, only a minimal emphasis is placed on training and retraining, with one major exception being the case of "displaced homemakers," older women who either lack labor-marketable skills or who need updating or training in new skills because of long absences from the paid labor force.

Of the few new abstracts from the NOWIS data base, one deserves special mention because it is aimed at a some of the millions of displaced homemakers in the United States. (Estimates as to numbers vary from about 2 million to over 11 million, although many in this latter estimate are elderly and not in the market for employment.) Maryland New Directions, Inc. helps displaced women build marketable skills through participation in workshops oriented toward skill building and job hunting. After the workshops, these women may move into an internship, direct job search, Graduate Equivalent Program, or classroom training. Training during a four-month internship is designed to get the participant a job with that or a similar establishment. Approximately 30 women are served each month.

Other nonprofit endeavors are involved more directly in advising, providing technical assistance to, or disseminating information to agencies, organizations, and corporations interested in utilizing older

workers. One of the largest of these is the Worker Equity Initiative of the 24-million-plus member American Association of Retired Persons. Not only is the Worker Equity Department overseeing the updating and expansion of NOWIS, but it is developing programs to (1) increase older workers' public and private sector employment, (2) ensure their equal access to employment and training opportunities, and (3) provide services to older workers "in transition," among whom can be found the older unemployed, career changers, and late-life first-time labor force entrants. The Department publishes a bimonthly newsletter, Working Age, on older worker employment issues available without charge to businesses and organizations interested in those issues. (A recent edition dealt with women in the workforce.) According to its director, the Department is developing resources for training directors who are seeking useful information on recruiting and training older workers (Gamse, May 1988).

Since JTPA's enactment, the National Association of State Units on Aging (NASUA) has, through publications and annual conferences on older workers, disseminated practical information on ways to implement JTPA programs successfully. This includes the recruitment, training, and placement of older workers. Making JTPA Work for Older Persons is a 1987 publication of "practical how-tos" that, indeed, includes very specific information on such topics as recruitment innovations, finding jobs for people over 55, self-employment, vocational education, and unsubsidized placement goals (Lordeman, et al., 1987).

The National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, a national SCSEP sponsoring organization, has attempted to ascertain what makes older worker placement programs succeed. Findings, along with recommendations on how to design and manage older worker placement systems, were summarized in a widely disseminated second volume on Job Placement Systems for Older Workers.

In addition to serving as an SCSEP national organization, the National Council on the Aging is involved in efforts to promote older worker employment through the coordination of federally funded training programs. NCOA's Prime Time Productivity hopes to serve as a catalyst for bringing together individuals involved in employment and training programs to develop a comprehensive set of employment and training programs for older people. Prime Time Productivity will also assist employers in the recruitment, training, and other efforts on behalf of older workers. Publications include The Aging Workforce, a new quarterly newsletter on management programs and strategies for dealing with older workers, and Corporate Newslines, a bulletin provides specific tips on hiring, training, and retaining older workers. (Training was the focus of the two-page February 1988 bulletin.)

The Representation of Women in Older Worker Training Programs

For many reasons, not the least of which is their predominance among the elderly poor, older women's interest and actual participation in training programs are matters of concern. A small and limited study by Tucker (1985) of well-trained, well-educated employees in jobs vulnerable to

obsolescence (geologists, engineers, physical scientists, cartographers, and hydrologists) found no differences in the training needs expressed by older women and men, but that says nothing about their actual enrollment in training programs.

On the surface, women would seem to be proportionately represented--or even overrepresented--in public training programs. (Data on private training programs are lacking.) As mentioned above, women are over 60 percent of the SCSEP participants and have been over half of the JTPA enrollees in recent years. Alegria and Figueroa (1986) reported that women were 58 percent of the three-percent set-aside terminees who found jobs. They were also apparently well-represented in the CETA programs; for instance, of the 55 and older new enrollees in CETA IIB and C programs in FY81, nearly six out of ten were women.

Women are 56 percent of the 55 and older population and 68 percent of the impoverished population 55 and above. Using income alone, women are proportionately represented in SCSEP but underrepresented in JTPA programs. The fact that older women are less likely than older men to be unemployed--they were only 38 percent of the 55+ unemployed population in 1987--undoubtedly explains some of their "underrepresentation" in JTPA. Data on job dislocation rates suggests that women are being proportionately served in JTPA Title III programs.

According to Centaur (1986: 29), the ideal candidate for experimental SCSEP 502(e) programs was often seen by program operators as a recently widowed or divorced woman aged 55 to 60 who was too young for social security. Such women were favorably disposed toward full-time private sector work and welcomed assistance from the experimental programs.

The fact that women do not appear to be discriminated against in public training programs says nothing about the adequacy of service. Displaced homemakers, in particular, who have not been targeted for special assistance under JTPA as they were under CETA, are probably particularly ill served. The 1984 Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act did authorize "spending up to \$84 million annually for services to single parents and homemakers, including displaced homemakers;" (U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1986: 48), and the number of programs serving them has increased from 400 to over 1,000. However, the sums involved are "still small" compared to the need (ibid.), and apparently, relatively few displaced homemakers benefit from them.

Moreover, the fact remains that only a very small proportion of the eligible of either sex are able to participate in public training programs. Considerably fewer than 150,000 persons 55 and older would seem to work their way through all SCSEP and JTPA programs combined in any one program year, and fewer obtain private sector employment as a result.

Value of Training

The effectiveness of training and retraining programs for older workers

remains to be evaluated. For the General Electric workers who managed to keep their jobs as a result of corporate training, it obviously paid off. Though warning against making too much of their findings, given methodological problems, Rupp, Bryant and Montovani (1983: 20) concluded that older worker participation in CETA appeared to have paid off by increasing the probability of being employed 15 months after leaving the program by 8.7 percentage points. An estimated annual earnings gain of \$400 immediately after program termination was due largely to the effect of finding a job.

In Datta's opinion (1987), dislocated worker programs are only minimally effective, in part because problems with relocating workers and in part because new jobs tend to be entry level ones, but the GAO study and the Labor Department's placement statistics indicates that such programs can have a positive impact. The problem, of course, in drawing definitive conclusions is the lack of adequate control groups for comparison. More systematic study of the effectiveness of various types of older worker training programs, though costly, might be warranted.

A Work in America policy study (1980) raises issues such as "why should an employee of 50, who may work to age 70, be barred from further training on the grounds of age alone?" and makes several recommendations concerning their training and development, among which are the following:

- Since developmental programs will have to stretch over a greater life span, concepts of training and development will have to become more elastic.
- Employers, when hiring for a new workforce, should first seek to train current employees, regardless of age, who wish to shift skills, careers, or assignments,
- Training opportunities should be advertised in order to attract workers of all ages.
- The notion that people who have specialized for many years in one field lack aptitude or ability to move into another must be discarded.
- The "linear" life pattern of growing and learning, working, and then retiring needs to be relaxed.
- Recognition must be given to the possibility that older workers have different learning patterns from younger ones.
- Training, even of older workers, is an investment in the career employee.

Future Training Needs

Age does result in job decrements and obsolescence in many occupations (Root and Zarrugh, 1983). For instance, in a study of white male professionals and managers aged 50 and 65, Andrisani and Daymont (1987) ascertained that the wages of the older workers were higher largely because of their longer job tenure. Had tenure and other factors not kept wages rising, wages would have declined by 18 percent, due to obsolescence as measured by years since schooling was completed. This finding begs the question of what type of retraining, skill updating, or education will keep older workers competitive and attractive to employers. In large part, the answer depends on projected occupational growth and the need for workers.

Between 1979 and 1986 the population of young adults--persons aged 16 to 24, who form the pool of entry level job aspirants--dropped by nearly three million, while a further 2.6 million decline is projected by the year 2000 (Fullerton, 1987: 23). Accompanying this demographic development has been a tremendous increase in job creation in the United States--some 26 million jobs were created between 1974 and 1984 alone (Schweke and Jones, 1986: 18); by the turn of the century, the number of jobs may be over 20 million greater, if the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics projections (Silvestri and Lukasiewicz, 1987) are at all close to the mark. Job growth seems assured. But will it include jobs for older workers?

On the one hand, the greatest rate of job growth will be in fields where further technological advances requiring repeated skill updating can be expected. Most of the jobs listed in Table A10 would seem to fall into this category. Those jobs, however, will account for less than seven percent of the projected numerical increase in occupations between now and the turn of the century.

According to projections of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (ibid.), nearly 44 percent of the new jobs by the year 2000 will be in 20 occupations, the majority of which would not be classified as highly technical or highly skilled--retail sales, waiters and waitresses, cashiers, truck drivers, food service workers (Table A11).

This is not to suggest a growing demand for unskilled workers because even the occupations in Table A11 will require oral and written skills and most likely familiarity with rapidly changing computer technology (e.g., computerized cash registers). Who will get the good jobs will undoubtedly depend on recency of training for those desirable jobs for which there might be keen competition. All of these and other considerations discussed above call for a greater commitment to skill-updating on a continuing basis for men and women of all ages. This will also entail greater awareness and increased commitment by employers, government, labor, and individual workers themselves.

References

- Alegria, Fernando L. and Jose R. Figueroa. Study of the JTPA Eight Percent Education Coordination and Grants Set-Aside and the Three Percent Set-Aside Training Program for Older Individuals. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1986.
- Alegria, Fernando L. and Ann Lordeman. Serving Older Individuals Under the Job Training Partnership Act: State Initiatives and Practices. Washington, D.C. National Governors' Association, May 1988 (draft).
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Workers Over 50: Old Myths, New Realities. Washington, D.C.: AARP, undated.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Work and Retirement: Employees Over 40 and Their Views. Washington, D.C.: AARP, 1986a.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Workers 45+: Today and Tomorrow. Washington, D.C.: AARP, 1986b.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Early Retirement: Boom or Bust? Conference Sponsored by AARP's Worker Equity Department. Los Angeles, California: December 7, 1987.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Managing an Older Work Force. Washington, D.C.: AARP, 1988.
- Anderson, Craig. "Death to Computerphobia," Journal of National Association of Bank Women, September/October 1983.
- Andrisani, Paul and Thomas Daymont. "Changes in Productivity and Earnings Among Managers and Professionals." Pp. 52-70 in Steven H. Sandell (ed.), The Problem Isn't Age. New York: Praeger. 1987.
- Bové, Robert. "Retraining the Older Worker," Training and Development Journal, March 1987, pp. 77-78.
- The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (BNA). Older Americans in the Workforce: Challenges and Solutions. Washington, D.C.: BNA, 1987.
- Carnevale, Anthony. "Improving Productivity in the Aging Workforce." Pp. 48-56 in America's Aging Workforce, A Travelers Symposium. Proceedings. Hartford, Connecticut: The Travelers Companies, 1986.
- Centaur Associates, Inc. Report on the 502(e) Experimental Projects Funded Under Title V of the Older American Act. Washington, D.C.: Centaur Associates, July 25, 1986.
- Datta, Lois-ellen. "Dislocated Workers in the United States: Assistance, Amelioration, and Prevention." Pp. 173-193 in Ray C. Rist (ed.), Finding

- Work. London: The Falmer Press, 1986.
- Fullerton, Howard N. "Labor Force Projections: 1986 to 2000," Monthly Labor Review, September 1987, pp. 19-29.
- Gamse, David, Director of the Worker Equity Program, American Association of Retired Persons, Conversation with one of the authors, May 1988.
- Jacobson, Beverly. Young Programs for Older Workers. New York: Van Nostrand/Work in American Institute Series, 1980.
- Knox, Kathleen. Case Study: Polaroid Tuition Assistance Plan. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute, 1979.
- Lordeman, Ann, Terry T. Nixon, and Frances R. Rothstein. Making JTPA Work for Older Persons: A National Catalogue of Practical How-To's. Washington, D.C.: National Association of state Units on Aging, May 1987.
- Lusterman, Seymour. Trends in Corporate Education and Training. New York: The Conference Board, 1985.
- Mintz, Florence. "The Graying of the Training Room," Personnel, October 1986, pp. 69-71.
- National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc. (NCBA). Job Placement Systems for Older Workers. Volume One: Research Findings, Case Studies, Program Models and Volume Two: A Planning Framework, Placement Tools and Techniques. Washington, D.C.: NCBA, 1987.
- National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP). Older Worker Employment Comes of Age: Practice and Potential. Washington, D.C.: NCEP, undated.
- National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP). Older Workers: Prospects, Problems, and Policies. 9th Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: NCEP, 1985.
- Nye, David. Alternative Staffing Strategies. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1988.
- Olson, Laurence, et al. The Elderly and the Economy. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1981.
- Rhine, Shirley H. Managing Older Workers: Company Policies and Attitudes. New York: The Conference Board, 1985.
- Root, Lawrence S. and Laura H. Zarrugh. Innovative Employment Practices for Older Americans. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1983.
- Rosen Bensen and Thomas H. Jerdee. Older Employees: New Roles for Valued Resources. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1985.
- Rothstein, Frances R. "Older Worker Employment Opportunities in the Private Sector," Pp 148-158 in R. Morris and S.A. Bass (eds.), Retirement

- Reconsidered: Economic and Social Roles for Older People. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1988.
- Rupp, Kalman, Edward C. Bryant, and Richard E. Montovani. Factors Affecting the Participation of Older Americans in Employment and Training Programs. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1983.
- Sandell, Steven H. and Kalman Rupp. Who Is Served in JTPA Programs: Patterns of Participation and Intergroup Equity. Washington, D.C. National Commission for Employment Policy, 1988.
- Schwenke, William and David R. Jones. "European Job Creation in the Wake of Plant Closing and Layoffs." Monthly Labor Review, October 1986, pp. 18-22.
- Shapiro, David and Steven Sandell. "Age Discrimination in Wages and Displaced Older Men." Southern Economic Journal, July 1985, pp. 90-102.
- Silvestri, George T. and John M. Lukasiewicz. "A Look at Occupational Employment Trends to the Year 2000." Monthly Labor Review, September 1987, pp. 46-63.
- Stepp, John R., Remarks at the conference "An Aging Work Force: Agenda for Action," sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor and Wayne State University, Detroit, March 10-11, 1988.
- Tucker, Florence. "A Study of the Training Needs of Older Workers: Implications for Human Resources Development Planning." Public Personnel Management Journal 14, Spring 1985, pp. 85-95.
- U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. "Workplace Technology and the Employment of Older Adults," Chapter 10 in Technology and Aging in America. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985.
- U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. Technology and Structural Unemployment: Reemploying Displaced Adults. Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.
- U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging. Personnel Practices for an Aging Workforce: Private-Sector Examples. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985.
- U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging. Developments in Aging: 1986, Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.
- U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging. Developments in Aging: 1987, Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.
- U.S. Department of Education, Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics 1987. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.
- U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor, 1985. Washington, D.C.: DOL, undated mimeo.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Handbook of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 2217. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985.

U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During FY 1986. Washington, D.C: DOL, December 1987.

U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Summary of JTQS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During July-September 1987. Washington, D.C. DOL Division of Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development, March 1988.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and Earnings 1988. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1986 and January 1988.

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). Dislocated Workers: Local Programs and Outcomes Under the Job Training Partnership Act. Washington, D.C.: GAO, March 1987.

Work in America Institute. The Future of Older Workers in America. Scarsdale, New York: Work in America Institute, 1980.

APPENDIX A

Tables

Table A1: Civilian Labor Force Participants by Age and Sex:
Actual, 1979 and 1987, and Projected, 2000
(moderate growth assumptions; numbers in thousands)

	1979	1987	2000
Total, both sexes	104,960	119,865	138,775
Men, 16 and over	60,727	66,207	73,136
16 to 19	5,111	4,112	4,501
20 to 24	8,534	7,837	7,005
25 to 34	16,386	19,656	16,559
35 to 44	11,532	15,587	20,133
45 to 54	10,008	10,176	16,332
55 to 64	7,213	6,940	7,238
65 and over	1,943	1,899	1,368
Women, 16 and over	44,233	53,658	65,639
16 to 19	4,527	3,875	4,379
20 to 24	7,233	7,140	6,746
25 to 34	11,550	15,577	15,098
34 to 44	8,153	12,873	18,438
45 to 54	6,891	8,034	14,220
55 to 64	4,718	4,937	5,732
65 and over	1,161	1,221	1,026

Source: Howard N Fullerton, Jr., "Labor Force Projections: 1986 to 2000," Monthly Labor Review, September 1987, p. 25; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1988, Table 3. :

Table A2: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates of
Men and Women, 55 and Older, 1948-1987

Year	Men		Women	
	55-64	65+	55-64	65+
1948	89.5	46.8	24.3	9.1
1950	86.9	45.8	27.0	9.7
1955	87.9	39.6	32.5	10.6
1960	86.8	33.1	37.2	10.8
1965	84.6	27.9	41.1	10.0
1970	83.0	26.8	43.0	9.7
1975	75.6	21.6	40.9	8.2
1980	72.1	19.0	41.3	8.1
1985	67.9	15.8	42.0	7.3
1987	67.6	16.3	42.7	7.4

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985, and Employment and Earnings, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1986, Table 3 and January 1988, Table 3.

Table A3: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates of Men and Women
Aged 55 and Over, Actual, 1987 and Projected, 1990, 1995, and 2000
(moderate growth projections)

Age	Men				Women			
	1987	1990	1995	2000	1987	1990	1995	2000
55 and over	40.4	36.8	34.3	34.1	22.0	21.0	20.4	21.4
55-64	67.6	65.1	64.0	63.2	42.7	42.8	44.3	45.8
55-59	79.7	77.8	76.6	75.2	52.2	52.4	53.9	55.3
60-64	54.9	52.8	49.8	47.9	33.2	33.5	33.7	33.9
60 and 61	67.6	65.5	63.2	60.9	41.0	40.3	40.5	40.6
62 to 64	46.0	43.0	40.4	38.2	27.8	28.8	28.9	29.0
65 and over	16.3	14.1	11.9	9.9	7.4	7.0	6.2	5.4
65-69	25.8	22.5	20.1	17.9	14.3	13.4	12.5	11.4
70 and over	10.5	9.2	7.7	6.3	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.2

Source, U.S. Bureau of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1988, and unpublished data.

Table A4: Courses Taken by Older Men and Women in Adult Education,
by Main Reason, Year Ending, May 1984

Reason	Courses Taken by			
	Men		Women	
	55-64 %	65+ %	55-64 %	65+ %
Job-related	68.4	30.5	47.9	16.8
To get new job	4.2	3.6	3.3	1.1
in current occupation	1.4	1.0	1.3	0.1
in new occupation	2.8	2.7	1.9	1.0
To advance in job	60.0	25.4	40.5	15.2
Other	4.1	1.2	4.2	0.6
Not job-related	31.6	69.5	51.2	83.2
Not reported	--	--	0.9	--
Total courses taken (in thousands)	1,328	413	1,796	822

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Center for Education Statistics,
Digest of Education Statistics 1987. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government
Printing Office, May 1987, Table 220.

Table A5: Participants in Post-Secondary Education by Age, October 1982

Age	Type of Education			Age Distribution of Population, 1982
	Academic %	Vocational %	Continuing %	
16-24	67.2	48.4	16.4	22.5*
25-34	23.2	28.5	32.2	22.1
35-44	6.8	13.8	21.7	16.1
45-54	2.1	6.3	13.8	12.5
55-64	0.6	2.5	9.9	12.3
65+	0.1	0.5	6.0	14.5
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number (in thousands)	9,243	3,787	5,177	178,101

*Persons 15 to 24.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Digest of Education Statistics, 1987, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1987, Table 217; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 142, Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1982, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1984, Table 46.

Table A6: Age Distribution of Participants under CETA Titles IIB/C, Fiscal Year 1982, and under JTPA Title IIA, Program Years 1984-85 and 1986*

Age	CETA Titles II B/C (FY 1982) %	JTPA Title IIA (PY 1984-85) %	JTPA Title IIA (PY 1986) %
14-15	3.1	--	--
16-21	37.7	40.4	42.0
22-44	52.5	52.9	51.0
45-54	4.4	4.3	4.0
55+	2.3	2.4	3.0
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	834,515	717,600	786,100

*CETA programs were funded on a fiscal year, while JTPA programs operate on a program year, which runs from 1 July to 30 June.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, 1983 Employment and Training Report of the Secretary, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Labor, mimeo, Table 4; Steven H. Sandell and Kalman Rupp, Who is Served in JTPA Programs: Patterns of Participation and Intergroup Equity, Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, February 1988, Table 9; U.S. Department of Labor, Summary of JTPS Data for JPTA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1986, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development, December 1987, Table C-1.

Table A7: Unemployment Rates by Sex, Occupation, and Age, 1986

	All Ages, 16+	45-54	55-59	60-64	65+
<u>Men</u>					
Executive, admin., managerial	2.2	2.5	2.1	1.9	2.0
Professional specialty	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.5	3.3
Technicians & related	3.8	2.5	2.3	3.1	2.1
Sales	3.4	2.5	2.3	2.3	1.6
Administrative support, including clerical	4.7	2.7	2.3	3.8	3.1
Service	8.4	5.3	4.9	3.5	5.6
Precision, production, craft, repair	7.0	5.4	6.4	6.9	4.2
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	10.5	8.0	9.1	5.9	6.2
Farm operators & managers	0.6	0.6	0.2	-	0.2
Farm workers, & related	11.4	8.7	9.0	5.2	2.6
Total rate, all occupations	6.9	4.4	4.6	3.9	3.2
<u>Women</u>					
Executive, admin., managerial	3.3	2.9	2.4	3.4	2.4
Professional specialty	2.3	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8
Technicians & related	3.1	2.8	3.0	4.4	1.9
Sales	6.9	5.0	3.2	3.0	2.2
Administrative support, including clerical	4.7	3.6	2.9	3.4	1.8
Service	8.8	5.5	4.5	4.7	2.4
Precision, production, craft, repair	9.2	7.0	4.4	5.4	3.8
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	11.8	8.3	8.2	5.8	10.3
Farm operators & managers	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.6	0
Farm workers & related	13.5	9.1	4.1	3.4	5.6
Total rate, all occupations	7.1	4.5	3.8	3.8	2.8

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table A8: Employed Persons by Sex, Occupation, and Age,
1987 annual averages (in percentages)

	All Ages, 16+	45-54	55-59	60-64	65+
<u>Men</u>					
Executive, admin., managerial	13.3	17.8	17.1	17.5	14.6
Professional specialty	11.6	13.4	12.5	12.6	12.8
Technicians & related	2.8	2.4	1.9	1.5	0.8
Sales	11.3	11.3	11.5	12.4	15.9
Administrative support, including clerical	5.9	4.9	5.8	4.8	5.7
Service	9.5	6.9	7.6	9.7	12.0
Precision, production, craft, repair	20.0	21.1	20.2	17.3	11.4
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	20.9	18.2	18.4	16.4	11.3
Farm operators & managers	1.8	2.1	2.9	5.0	10.3
Farm workers, forestry, fishing	2.9	1.9	2.0	2.6	5.1
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number (in thousands)	62,107	9,750	4,027	2,655	1,850
<u>Women</u>					
Executive, admin., managerial	10.0	11.3	10.2	9.1	8.2
Professional specialty	14.4	15.5	12.6	10.4	10.2
Technicians & related	3.2	2.5	1.7	1.6	1.1
Sales	12.8	10.5	11.7	14.1	14.9
Administrative support, including clerical	29.0	29.5	29.2	30.4	24.1
Service	18.1	16.4	19.3	20.0	29.1
Precision, production, craft, repair	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.7
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	9.0	10.4	10.9	10.2	6.8
Farm operators & managers	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.9
Farm workers, forestry, fishing	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.9
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number (in thousands)	50,334	7,737	2,922	1,861	1,191

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, unpublished data.

Table A9: Age Distribution of Employed Workers by Sex
and Occupation, 1986
(in percentages)

	<u>Age</u>					
	<35	35-54	55-59	60-64	65+	Total
<u>Men</u>						
Executive, admin., managerial	34.4	49.5	7.8	5.1	3.2	100.0
Professional specialty	37.6	47.5	7.2	4.6	3.1	100.0
Technical, sales, & administrative support	47.9	38.0	6.5	4.4	3.2	100.0
Sales	44.6	39.5	6.9	5.0	4.0	100.0
Administrative support, including clerical	51.1	35.6	6.4	4.1	2.8	100.0
Service	57.0	29.0	5.6	4.2	3.6	100.0
Precision, production, craft, repair	47.7	40.3	6.5	3.8	1.6	100.0
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	55.9	33.5	5.6	3.5	1.5	100.0
Farm operators & managers	24.7	36.3	11.0	10.8	17.1	100.0
Farm workers & related	62.2	23.9	4.4	4.3	5.3	100.0
<u>Women</u>						
Executive, admin., managerial	43.0	46.3	5.6	3.3	1.8	100.0
Professional specialty	42.9	47.3	5.3	2.9	1.7	100.0
Technical, sales, & administrative support	51.8	36.6	5.7	3.7	2.2	100.0
Sales	56.7	31.2	5.5	3.7	2.9	100.0
Administrative support, including clerical	49.0	39.0	6.0	3.9	2.0	100.0
Service	52.2	33.6	6.1	4.4	3.6	100.0
Precision, production, craft, repair	43.3	42.7	7.3	4.2	2.5	100.0
Operatives, fabricators, laborers	45.0	41.6	7.2	4.4	1.8	100.0
Farm operators & managers	20.9	48.1	12.8	8.0	10.2	100.0
Farm workers & related	50.6	34.8	6.6	3.7	4.3	100.0

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table A10: Fastest Growing Occupations, 1986-2000
(moderate alternative; numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Employment		Change in Employment 1986-2000	
	1986	Projected, 2000	Number	Percent
Paralegal personnel	61	125	64	103.7
Medical assistant	132	251	119	90.4
Physical therapists	61	115	53	87.5
Physical and corrective therapy assistants and aides	36	65	29	81.6
Data processing equipment repairers	69	125	56	80.4
Home health aides	138	249	111	80.1
Podiatrists	13	23	10	77.2
Computer systems analysts, electronic data processing	331	582	251	75.6
Medical records technicians	40	70	30	75.0
Employment interviewers, private or public employment service	75	129	54	71.2
Computer programmers	479	813	335	69.9
Radiologic technologists and technicians	115	190	75	64.7
Dental hygienists	87	141	54	62.6
Dental assistants	155	244	88	57.0
Physician assistants	26	41	15	56.7
Operations and systems researchers	38	59	21	54.1
Occupational therapists	29	45	15	52.2
Peripheral electronic data processing equipment operators	46	70	24	50.8
Data entry keyers, composing	29	43	15	50.8
Optometrists	37	55	18	49.2

Source: George T. Silvestri and John M. Lukasiewicz, "A Look at Occupational Trends to the Year 2000," Monthly Labor Review, September 1986, p. 58.

Table A11: Occupations With the Largest Job Growth, 1986-2000
(moderate alternative; numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Employment		Change in Employment 1986-2000	
	1986	Projected, 2000	Number	Percent
Salespersons, retail	3,579	4,780	1,201	33.5
Waiters and waitresses	1,702	2,454	752	44.2
Registered nurses	1,406	2,018	612	43.6
Janitors and cleaners	2,676	3,280	604	22.6
General managers and top executives	2,383	2,965	582	24.4
Cashiers	2,165	2,740	575	26.5
Truck drivers	2,211	2,736	525	23.8
General office clerks	2,361	2,824	462	19.6
Food counter, fountain, and related workers	1,500	1,949	449	29.9
Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants	1,224	1,658	433	35.4
Secretaries	3,234	3,658	424	13.1
Guards	794	1,177	383	48.3
Accountants and auditors	945	1,322	376	39.8
Computer programmers	479	813	335	69.9
Food preparation workers	949	1,273	324	34.2
Teachers, kindergarten and elementary	1,527	1,826	299	19.6
Receptionists and information clerks	682	964	282	41.4
Computer systems analysts, electronic data processing	331	582	251	75.6
Cooks, restaurant	520	759	240	46.2
Licensed practical nurses	631	869	238	37.7

Source: George T. Silvestri and John M. Lukasiewicz. "A Look at Occupational Trends to the Year 2000," Monthly Labor Review, September 1987, p. 59.

APPENDIX B

Summaries of Selected Older Worker Laws and Programs

Appendix B

Summaries of Selected Older Worker Laws and Programs

Age Discrimination in Employment Act

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (as amended in subsequent years) makes it unlawful for any employer "to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual [aged 40 or over] or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's age" or "to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's age." With the 1986 amendments, mandatory retirement was eliminated in all but a very few occupations.

The Job Training Partnership Act

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was passed on October 13, 1982 "to establish programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to afford job training to those economically disadvantaged individuals and other individuals facing serious barriers to employment, who are in special need of such training to obtain productive employment." Title IIA of the JTPA is designed to provide training services primarily to the economically disadvantaged. However, the law specifies that up to 10 percent of the participants need not be economically disadvantaged if they have encountered barriers to employment. Examples noted in the law include persons with limited English language proficiency, displaced homemakers, school dropouts, the handicapped, older workers, veterans, offenders, alcoholics, and addicts. In addition, Sec. 202(b)(2) sets aside three percent of a state's allotment for older worker training and placement programs. The law charges the Governor of a state to "give consideration to assisting programs involving training for jobs in growth industries and jobs reflecting the use of new technological skills." Only persons 55 years of age and older who are economically disadvantaged are eligible to participate in the three-percent set-aside programs.

Title III of the JTPA is designed to provide employment and training assistance for dislocated workers. Eligible are workers who are laid off or who have received notice of termination due to layoff or plant closing, and who are unlikely to return to their previous industry or line of work. The law also singles out individuals who "are long-term unemployed and have limited opportunities for employment or reemployment in the same or similar occupation in the area in which such individual reside, including any older individuals who may have substantial barriers to employment by reason of age." Services are provided regardless of income.

The requirement that workers only be economically disadvantaged under Title II of JTPA is significantly less restrictive than the requirements

of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), which JTPA replaced. CETA participants had to be economically disadvantaged and either unemployed, underemployed, or in school. Another major difference between the two programs is that JTPA focuses on unsubsidized employment. Moreover, CETA did not set aside funds for older workers.

Responsibility for the training programs under JTPA rests with the states, with substantial involvement (or the partnership) of private business and industry at both the State and local levels.

JTPA is funded on a program year, which runs from July 1 to the following June 30. The first nine months of the program (October 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984) were a period of transition from CETA to JTPA. The first full program year ran from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985.

The Senior Community Service Employment Program

The Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) is authorized by Title V of the Older Americans Act. SCSEP provides "useful" part-time subsidized employment in community service activities to low income persons 55 and older. Eligibility is restricted to persons whose income is below 125 percent of the poverty level. Training, counseling, and supportive services (e.g., physical examinations) may also be provided. Funds for administering the program are provided to eight national organizations (American Association of Retired Persons, Green Thumb, Inc., National Association for Hispanic Elderly, National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, National Council on the Aging, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Urban League, and the U.S. Forest Service), as well as to State and territorial governments.

The 1983 Amendments to the Social Security Act

Among the many legislative changes designed to restore short- and long-term solvency to the social security system was an increase in the age at which full social security benefits would be available to retired workers. Beginning in the year 2000, the now full-retirement age of 65 will be increased by two months per year until it reaches 66 in 2005. Beginning in 2017, the full retirement age of 66 will be increased by two months per year until it reaches 67 in 2022.

APPENDIX C

Older Worker Training Resources and Information

Appendix C

Older Worker Training Resources and Information

Selected Readings on Older Worker Training Issues

Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (BNA). Older Americans in the Workforce: Challenges & Solutions. Washington, D.C.: BNA, 1987. (Numerous descriptive "case studies" of corporate programs in such areas as training and retraining, flexible work arrangements, rehiring, and preretirement planning.)

Journal of Aging and Work (formerly Industrial Gerontology), 1970-1982/83, Washington, D.C.: National Council on the Aging.

Lester, Brenda. A Practitioner's Guide for Training Older Workers. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, undated.

Lordeman, Ann; Terry T. Nixon, and Frances R. Rothstein. Making JTPA Work for Older Persons: A National Catalogue of Practical How-To's. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Units on Aging, May 1987.

The Older Worker Newsletter, 8555 16th Street, Suite 100, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc. Job Placement Systems for Older Workers. Washington, D.C.: NCBA, 1987. (Two volumes of descriptions of successful older worker programs, including those involving training, and of advice on how to implement such programs.)

National Commission for Employment Policy. Older Worker Employment Comes of Age: Practice and Potential (NCEP). Washington, D.C.: NCEP, undated. (Overview of public, private, and community older worker policies and practices; employer and labor older worker initiatives; state and local older work policy actions; community-based older worker efforts.)

U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging. Personnel Practices for an Aging Work Force: Private-Sector Examples. S. Prt. 99-10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. (Descriptions of selected older worker programs in original National Older Worker Information System [NOWIS]).

Useful Addresses (as of July 1988)

1. National Sponsors for Title V Senior Community Service Employment Programs (Write to Director, Title V SCSEP Programs.)

American Association of Retired Persons
1909 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20049

Asociacion National pro Personas Mayores
(National Association for Hispanic Elderly)
2727 West Sixth Street
Suite 270
Los Angeles, California 90057

Green Thumb, Inc.
5111 Leesburg Pike
Suite 107
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

National Council of Senior Citizens
925 15th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc.
1424 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Council on the Aging, Inc.
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
West Wing 100
Washington, D.C. 20024

National Urban League
500 East 62nd Street
New York, New York 10021

USDA Forest Service
Hamilton Building
1375 K Street, NW
Suite 613
Washington, D.C. 20019

2. Older Worker Resources

Displaced Homemakers Network
1411 K Street, NW
Suite 1411
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Association of State Units on Aging
2033 K Street, NW
Suite 304
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc.
1424 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Prime Time Productivity
National Council on the Aging
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
West Wing 100
Washington, D.C. 20024

Worker Equity Department
American Association of Retired Persons
1909 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20049
(also the address for information on the National Older Worker
Information System)

3. Businesses, Organizations, and Agencies Conducting Research on Older
Worker Issues

American Society for Training and Development
1630 Duke Street
Box 1443
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
1231 25th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

The Conference Board
845 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Employee Benefit Research Institute
2121 K Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20037

National Alliance of Business
1015 15th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1620 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

1 2
National Commission for Employment Policy
1522 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005

U.S. Department of Labor
ETA/Division of Older Worker Programs
Room N-4641
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20210

Work in America Institute
700 White Plains Road
Scarsdale, New York 10853